



City of Seattle

Gregory J. Nickels, Mayor
Department of Design, Construction and Land Use
D. M. Sugimura, Director

**CITY OF SEATTLE
ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE DIRECTOR
OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION AND LAND USE**

Application Number: 2204181 and 2205526

Applicant Name: Garrett Birkeland for Howland Homes

Address of Proposal: 2140 North 113th Street (2204181)
2130 North 113th Street (2205526)

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTIONS

Project #2204181 – Council Land Use Action to Rezone 14,168.31 sq. ft. of land from SF7200, single family to a multifamily zone, Lowrise 1. Property is located approximately 135 feet westerly of the northwest corner of Corliss Avenue North and North 113th Street.

Project #2205526 – Council Land Use Action to rezone 8,130.75 sq. ft. of land from SF7200, single family to a multifamily zone, Lowrise 1. Property is located approximately 240 feet from the northwest corner of Corliss Avenue North/North 113th Street.

For each project, the following approvals are required:

Rezone - To rezone from SF7200 to L1 - Seattle Municipal Code 23.34

SEPA - Environmental Determination - Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 25.05.

SEPA DETERMINATION: ☐ Exempt ☒ DNS* ☐ MDNS ☐ EIS

☐ DNS with conditions

☐ DNS involving non-exempt grading, or demolition,
or another agency with jurisdiction.

*Notice of Early DNS was published on 14 November 2002.

BACKGROUND DATA

Site and Vicinity Description

The subject parcels, which are adjacent and under common ownership, are zoned SF7200 and are located in the interior of the block between Meridian and Corliss Avenues North on the north side of North 113th Street, which is paved but lacks sidewalks, planting strips, curbs, and gutters on both sides in the project area. The parcels total almost 23,000 square feet in area. The east site is developed with a single family residence; the house formerly existing on the west site was properly removed pursuant to abatement order.

Evergreen-Washelli cemetery is located less than a block to the west. A substantial chunk of property to the west and north is zoned for single family development and is actually mostly developed with such structures. To the east, in the adjacent L1 zone, are a couple of duplexes and a triplex. To the south across North 113th Street, in an L3 zone, are located a preponderance of apartment buildings, with several single family residences remaining. The Northgate Ramada Inn is a little more than a block to the south, though not accessible by heading due south. Vehicular circulation to the west and south is largely cut off by I-5 and its associated ramps. Consequently, access to the immediate neighborhood is from the west and north (Meridian and North 115th Street).

Proposal Description

The proposal affects two separate, adjacent lots, and proposes that they be rezoned from SF to L1. It is intended to accommodate development of up to 12 townhouse units, although the development plan is purely conceptual, hence, entirely flexible. Access would be taken from one point along North 113th Street, and parking would be between rows of townhouses laid out east-to-west on the site. Any other development comporting with development standards could be proposed and approved. Alternatively, departures from standards could be considered through the Design Review process. Most likely the existing structures on the sites would be demolished.

Public Comments

The City received eight comment letters in opposition to the proposed rezone, including ones from the Maple Leaf Community Council and the Haller Lake Community Club. Several letters noted that approving the proposal would significantly disrupt the pattern, character, and livability of the neighborhood. In addition, the Maple Leaf letter points out the increasing trend toward single family development in the Northgate Plan area, the appropriateness of keeping the zone boundary at the topographic “break” located along the east property line of the subject site, the likelihood of substantial departures from existing single family character given development under L1 standards (as exhibited by illustrative concept scheme submitted with the application), inability of the sites to provide adequate buffering between the existing SF zoned properties and the proposed L1 zone boundary, the direction of increased residential density to core areas under

the Northgate Plan, and Northgate Plan policy statements protecting existing SF-zoned areas, and precedential impacts of proposal disposition given how common are similar zoning edge conditions. The Haller Lake letter noted that the subject site is covered by the Haller Lake plan. One letter expressed concern about privacy impacts and view blockage by potential future development. Finally, one letter expressed concern about adequacy of proposed parking (1 parking space per unit).

ANALYSIS - REZONE

A rezone from SF 7200 to L1 requires a three-part analysis. First is the requirement that “Single family areas may be rezoned to another classification only if the applicant can demonstrate that the area does not meet the criteria for single family designation (Section 23.34.010 & 23.34.011); second, the criteria for designation of a L1 zone (Section 23.34.018); and third, the general rezone criteria must be satisfied (Section 23.34.008).

First Test

Single-family zones function to provide predominantly detached single-family structures on lot sizes compatible with the existing pattern of development and the character of single-family neighborhoods. As stated above, a single family zoned parcel may be rezoned to another classification only if the applicant can demonstrate that the area does not meet the criteria for single family designation (SMC 23.34.010). There are three criteria that must be analyzed, and these include function, locational criteria and size criteria (SMC 23.34.011)

A. Function. An area that provides predominately detached single-family structures on lot sizes compatible with the existing pattern of development and the character of single-family neighborhoods.

A substantial portion of the area provides predominantly detached single family structures on lot sizes compatible with the existing pattern of development. The GIS clearly demonstrates that the properties in the area north of North 113th Street and west of Meridian Avenue North are predominantly developed with single family structures. Properties south of 113th are predominantly developed in accordance with their zoning designation (non-SF). Thus, it is most reasonable to conclude that the subject parcels satisfy the function criterion, Criterion A, for SF designation.

B. Locational Criteria. A single-family zone designation is most appropriate in areas meeting the following criteria:

1. *Areas that consist of blocks with at least seventy percent (70%) of the existing structures in single-family residential use; or*

Not met.

2. *Areas that are designated by an adopted neighborhood plan as appropriate for single-family residential use; or*

MET.

The site is well within the area addressed by the Northgate Area Comprehensive Plan (the "Northgate Plan"), which was adopted in a series of ordinances approved on or before August 10, 1993. The plan consists of policies, implementation guidelines, and the Land Use Code regulations in SMC Chapter 23.71, the Northgate Overlay. Ordinance No. 116770 identifies specific Northgate Plan implementation guidelines as "policies" to be considered pursuant to SEPA authority at SMC Section 25.05.665.C.1 and 25.05.675.R.2.e, namely Implementation Guidelines 4.3, 8.3, 10.3, 10.4, 11.1-11.3, 14.1 and 16.5. Guideline 4.3 indicates that, outside of the Northgate Core area (and the subject sites are out of the core area); land use actions shall be directed to protect existing single family neighborhoods. Although this policy allows for rezoning of SF areas, it imposes a substantial burden of proof that such a rezone is not inconsistent with this implementation guideline. In this case, the burden of proof is not met. Given clear policy statements well supporting designation of the subject area as appropriate for single family residential use, this criterion is deemed met.

3. *Areas that consist of blocks with less than seventy percent (70%) of the existing structures in single-family residential use but in which an increasing trend toward single-family residential use can be demonstrated; for example:*

- a. *The construction of single-family structures in the last five (5) years has been increasing proportionately to the total number of construction for new uses in the area, or*

Not met.

- b. *The area shows an increasing number of improvements and rehabilitation efforts to single-family structures, or*

MET

In particular, three single family residences show year 2000 permits for electrical and furnace upgrades (e.g. 11344 Meridian, 2130 and 2136 N. 114th). 11322 Meridian shows a 1995 permit to add an ADU; 2133 N. 114th shows a 1987 permit to add a 1st and 2nd story with deck and attached garage; and 11322 Meridian shows a 1985 permit to add a greenhouse and wood storage area. Clearly, improvements have increased between the 80s and more recent times.

- c. *The number of existing single-family structures has been very stable or increasing in the last five (5) years, or*

MET

- d. *The area's location is topographically and environmentally suitable for single-family residential developments.*

MET

The locational criteria require that only one of three criteria be met, and one criterion (3) has sub-criteria that also require that only one be met. In this sense, the locational criteria are inclusive; they clearly intend to impose some substantial burden to demonstrate that existing SF-zoned parcels should not be included in the area of SF zoning of which they are a part. In this case, not only do the area and subject sites meet 2 of the 3 main criteria, they meet three of the 4 sub-criteria within criterion #3. Thus, it is most reasonable to conclude that the subject parcels satisfy the locational criteria, Criterion B, for SF designation.

C. *An area that meets at least one (1) of the locational criteria in subsection A above should also satisfy the following size criteria in order to be designated as a single-family zone:*

N/A, as pertains to the subject site.

1. *The area proposed for rezone should comprise fifteen (15) contiguous acres or more, or should abut an existing single-family zone.*
2. *If the area proposed for rezone contains less than fifteen (15) contiguous acres, and does not abut an existing single-family zone, then it should demonstrate strong or stable single-family residential use trends or potentials such as:*
 - a. *That the construction of single-family structures in the last five (5) years has been increasing proportionately to the total number of construction for new uses in the area, or*
 - b. *That the number of existing single-family structures has been very stable or increasing in the last five (5) years, or*
 - c. *That the area's location is topographically and environmentally suitable for single family structures, or*
 - d. *That the area shows an increasing number of improvements or rehabilitation efforts to single-family structures.*

D. *Half-blocks at the edges of single-family zones which have more than fifty percent (50%) single-family structures, or portions of blocks on an arterial which have a majority of single-family structures, shall generally be included. This shall be decided on a case-by-case basis, but the policy is to favor including them.*

In locations like the subject one, probably more than ordinary weight should be assigned to criterion 23.34.011.D, regarding half blocks at the edges of single family zones. In the half-

block along the north side of North 113th Street, there are four existing structures. Three are single family residences. Thus, the subject parcels meet this description.

Conclusion: First Test

The subject parcels meet the criteria for SF designation. Thus, pursuant to SMC section 23.34.010.A, the parcels may not be rezoned to a more intense zone. However, given the potential for a different recommendation by the Hearing Examiner, evaluation of the proposed L1 zoning and other applicable rezone criteria are provided below.

Second Test

The proposed rezone must meet the criteria for designation of a Lowrise 1 zone (SMC 23.34.016).

A. Function. An area that provides low density, primarily ground-related multifamily housing opportunities.

As discussed above, the subject sites are part of an area meeting SF criteria. The site is at the edge of an L3 zone to the south side of North 113th Street. Thus, neither the rezone sites nor the immediate block as defined by the Land Use Code, nor the larger area, are consistent with the described function of the L1 zone. Only the properties that are already zoned L1 are consistent, having been (re)developed according to the zoning standards. Such nearby structures should carry some weight; however, it is quite clear that they do not well characterize any area, even a small one. Thus, it is most reasonable to conclude that the subject sites do **not meet** the intended function of the Lowrise 1 zone.

B Locational Criteria. Lowrise 1 zone designation is most appropriate in areas generally characterized by the following:

1. Development Characteristics of the Area.

- a. Areas where structures of low heights, generally less than thirty (30) feet, and small bulk establish the pattern of development;*

Met

This criterion is met because the subject parcels are best considered as part of the SF-zoned area to the north and west.

b. Areas with:

- (1) *A mix of single-family structures, small multifamily structures and single-family structures legally converted into multiple units where, because of the type and quality of the existing housing stock, it is desirable to encourage new development opportunities, or*

Not met. Again, the SF-zoned area of which the parcels are best regarded as part is entirely single family in use.

- (2) *Numerous or large vacant parcels suitable for family housing where densities greater than single-family are desired; and*

Not met. Almost every lot in the nearby SF-zoned area south of North 115th Street and east of Meridian Avenue North are developed. There are only two vacant parcels in the SF-zoned area deemed to be pertinent to rezone analysis. One is the smaller subject parcel. In addition, the large lot to the west of the subject parcels is suitable for single family residential development and could be platted to accomplish two additional homes based on the SF7200 zone.

- c. Areas where internal vehicular circulation is conducive to residential units that are oriented to the ground level and the street. Preferred locations are generally separated from principal arterials, as defined by the Seattle Comprehensive Transportation Program, which conflict with the desired character of L1 areas.*

Met. The proponent has submitted a development plan showing internal circulation from one curb cut on N. 113th Street, and with residential units oriented to the ground level and to the street.

2. Relationship to the Surrounding Areas.

- a. Properties that are definable pockets within a larger, higher-density multifamily area, where it is desirable to preserve a small-scale character;*

Not met. Although one of the subject parcels is adjacent to L1 zoning, and both are across the street from L3 zoning, in both cases, the predominant factor is the SF-zoned area of which they are a part. Neither parcel can be considered in any sense a pocket within a larger, higher-density multifamily area.

- b. *Properties generally surrounded by a larger single-family area where variation and replacement in housing type could be accommodated without significant disruption of the pattern, character or livability of the surrounding development;*

Not met. It is possible that small-scale townhouses could be designed that would not significantly disrupt the pattern, character, or livability of the surrounding development, but it is not likely, particularly because of the SF7200 zone in the area, which is less dense even than other SF zones (e.g. SF5000). Rather, it is likely that L1 structures would be developed to the limit of applicable development standards, which would likely present substantial adverse privacy, light, shadowing, air, and noise impacts. L1 density limits would allow development of up to nine units on the larger parcel and five on the smaller. Public comments contain concerns about the discordance between L1-scale development and the existing single family development.

- c. *Properties where a gradual transition is appropriate between single-family areas and more intensive multifamily or neighborhood commercial zones;*

Not met. The westerly site clearly does not meet the criterion. The existing SF zoning provides adequate opportunity to buffer the remainder of the SF area by development of a SF structure. The lot size (8130 square feet), only slightly larger than the zone minimum, provides excellent opportunities for such a newly-developed single family residence to buffer itself from the L3 zoning across the street as well. The easterly site is adjacent to L1 zoning, where properties are developed with a duplex and a triplex. Extending the L1 zoning cannot properly be characterized as buffering L1 zoning; rather, it expands the impact area of the L1 zoning - in this case, for example, to the adjacent parcels to the west and north. Too, topography argues against the suitability of the easterly parcel for rezoning; there is a fairly marked topographic break within this parcel, with a substantial rise occurring not far west of the east property line.

- d. *Properties in areas where narrow streets, on-street parking congestion, local traffic congestion, or irregular street patterns restrict local access and circulation;*

Met.

- e. *Properties in areas close to facilities and services used by households with children, including schools, parks and community centers.*

Met.

Of the two main locational criteria for the L1 zone, neither is met. Criterion #1 is a draw, and of the 5 subcriteria of Criterion #2, only two are met.

C. Areas zoned single family meeting the locational criteria for single-family designation may be rezoned to L1 only when the provisions of Section 23.34.010.B are met.

Not met. SMC Section 23.34.010.B requires that a particular neighborhood plan identify the area as appropriate for L1 designation, which none does.

Second Test: Conclusion

The subject area and parcels do **not meet** the criteria for L1 designation.

Third Test

The proposed rezone must meet the General rezone criteria (23.34.008)

A. To be approved a rezone shall meet the following standards:

1. *In urban centers and urban villages the zoned capacity for the center or village taken as a whole shall be no less than one hundred twenty-five percent (125%) of the growth targets adopted in the Comprehensive Plan for that center or village.*

Presumed met.

2. *For the area within the urban village boundary of hub urban villages and for residential urban villages taken as a whole the zoned capacity shall be within the density ranges established in Section A1 of the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan.*

Presumed met.

B. Match between Zone Criteria and Area Characteristics. The most appropriate zone designation shall be that for which the provisions for designation of the zone type and the location criteria for the specific zone match the characteristics of the area to be rezoned better than any other zone designation.

Not met, as shown by discussion above of SF and L1 criteria.

C. Zoning History and Presidential Effect. Previous and potential zoning changes both in and around the area proposed for rezone shall be examined.

Title 23 SF zoning designations supplanted Title 24 RS designations in 1982. Since 1982, the material zoning changes have been the downzoning of the adjacent parcels to the east from L3 to L1 in 1990, and the application of the Northgate Overlay, with its SF-preservative policy language, in 1993. Neither of these support the case to rezone from SF to L1, and both can readily be interpreted to discourage such rezoning.

The essence of the case for rezoning the subject sites is that they are on a SF-zone edge. Yet they are typical zone-edge properties and, as has already been discussed, they do not meet the criterion for rezoning expressly applying at such zone edges (23.34.011.D). Approving the proposed rezones would likely set an inadvisable precedent minimizing the regulatory effect of this provision, which otherwise would clearly apply to typical properties in the City at SF-zone edges.

D. Neighborhood Plans.

1. *For the purposes of this title, the effect of a neighborhood plan, adopted or amended by the City Council after January 1, 1995, shall be as expressly established by the City Council for each such neighborhood plan.*
2. N/A
3. *Council adopted neighborhood plans that apply to the area proposed for rezone shall be taken into consideration.*

The essentially same criterion was discussed above. In short, the Northgate Area Comprehensive Plan (the "Northgate Plan") does not support the proposed rezone. Neither does it strongly discourage it.

4. *Where a neighborhood plan adopted or amended by the City Council after January 1, 1995 establishes policies expressly adopted for the purpose of guiding future rezones, but does not provide for rezones of particular sites or areas, rezones shall be in conformance with the rezone policies of such neighborhood plan.*
N/A
5. *If it is intended that rezones of particular sites or areas identified in a Council adopted neighborhood plan are to be required, then the rezones shall be approved simultaneously with the approval of the pertinent parts of the neighborhood plan.*
N/A

E. Zoning Principles. The following zoning principles shall be considered:

1. *The impact of more intensive zones on less intensive zones shall be minimized by the use of transitions or buffers, if possible. A gradual transition between zoning categories, including height limits, is preferred.*

Development of single family residences on the subject sites would provide the best transition from the existing multifamily zones to the existing SF zone. Certainly, expanding L1 cannot be properly characterized as buffering L1.

2. *Physical buffers may provide an effective separation between different uses and intensities of development. The following elements may be considered as buffers:*
 - a. *Natural features such as topographic breaks, lakes, rivers, streams, ravines and shorelines;*
 - b. *Freeways, expressways, other major traffic arterials, and railroad tracks;*
 - c. *Distinct change in street layout and block orientation;*
 - d. *Open spaces and green spaces.*

There is an existing topographic “break” between the L1 zone and the SF-zoned area hosting the subject parcels; it takes place on the east side of the easterly parcel. Maintenance of the existing zoning would preserve this break, and the buffering it provides.

3. *Zone Boundaries.*
 - a. *In establishing boundaries the following elements shall be considered:*
 - (1) *Physical buffers as described in subsection E2 above;*
 - (2) *Platted lot lines.*

In this case, L1 prevails in the project vicinity along Corliss Avenue North and North 113th Place, and L3 prevails on the south side of North 113th Street. In neither case does the existing higher-intensity zoning affect the south-facing side of North 113th Street. The proposal would erode that consistency, wrapping additional L1-zoned property around the corner to face south on North 113th Street. Maintaining the face of the higher zoning to the east only is appropriate on the north side of North 113th Street. Similarly, as discussed immediately above, the topographical “break” on the east side of the east subject site provides some natural basis for maintaining the zone edge where it is.

F. Impact Evaluation. The evaluation of a proposed rezone shall consider the possible negative and positive impacts on the area proposed for rezone and its surroundings.

1. *Factors to be examined include, but are not limited to, the following:*
 - a. *Housing, particularly low-income housing;*
 - b. *Public services;*

- c. *Environmental factors, such as noise, air and water quality, terrestrial and aquatic flora and fauna, glare, odor, shadows, and energy conservation;*
- d. *Pedestrian safety;*
- e. *Manufacturing activity;*
- f. *Employment activity;*
- g. *Character of areas recognized for architectural or historic value;*
- h. *Shoreline view, public access and recreation;*

Given that the subject parcels and area clearly meet SF criteria, impacts of the proposed development are best assessed in relation to impacts of development permissible on the subject parcels under the existing SF zoning, which would accommodate development of up to three single family residences given likely permissible future platting of the existing two lots into three. Three residences, on their face, would have lesser impacts than the 12 that are contemplated (14 allowed), certainly with respect to activity levels, traffic, parking demand, and noise. Siting impacts are not as clearly foreseeable, but three houses are likely to have less mass and certainly less impervious surfaces than 12 townhouses in 6 structures. Distances between buildings (existing and proposed), and hence privacy, light, and air movement are likely to be substantially greater under likely SF than likely L1 development. In the concept design, paving occupies 4728 square feet, whereas driveways serving 3 houses would likely be proposed at a maximum of about 1200 square feet.

- 2. *Service Capacities. Development which can reasonable be anticipated based on the proposed development potential shall not exceed the service capacities which can reasonable be anticipated in the area, including:*
 - a. *Street access to the area;*
 - b. *Street capacity in the area;*
 - c. *Transit service;*
 - d. *parking capacity;*
 - e. *Utility and sewer capacity;*
 - f. *shoreline navigation.*

Due to the limited additional development potential under the proposed L1 zoning, the above service capacities would be easily accommodated.

Overall, the impact analysis does not support the proposed rezone.

G. Changed Circumstances. Evidence of changed circumstances shall be taken into consideration in reviewing proposed rezones, but is not required to demonstrate the appropriateness of a proposed rezone. Consideration of changed circumstance shall be limited to elements or conditions included in the criteria for the relevant zone and/or overlay designations in this chapter.

It does not appear that circumstances have substantially changed since the SF zoning was applied to the site.

H. Overlay Districts. If the area is located in an overlay district, the purpose and boundaries of the overlay district shall be considered.

The implications of the subject parcels' inclusion in the Northgate Overlay Area have already been discussed; the overlay does not support the proposal, nor does it strongly discourage it.

I. Critical Areas. If the area is located in or adjacent to a critical area (SMC Chapter 25.09), the effect of the rezone on the critical area shall be considered.

N/A

RECOMMENDATION - REZONE

A summary of the above analysis may be seen in tabular form in the 3 pages of attachments to the decision. The table shows that the subject sites meet 7 of 9 criteria for designating SF zones, and do not meet the limited criteria for upzoning sites so characterized. The table shows that the subject sites meet only 4 of 11 criteria for designation of L1. The table shows that there are likely to be adverse impacts of the proposal.

Given overall findings, the Departmental recommends that both rezone applications be **DENIED.**

CONDITIONS - REZONE

It is not certain that the Hearing Examiner will concur with the Department's recommendation, or that the proposals will ultimately be denied by the City Council. Accordingly, the Department recommends that any rezone approval be conditioned as specified following SEPA analysis and conditions, near the end of this report and recommendation.

ANALYSIS - SEPA

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant, dated October 10, 2002, and annotated by the Department. The information in the checklist, supplemental information provided by the applicant, project plans, and the experience of the lead agency with review of same project form the basis for this analysis and decision.

The SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665 D) clarifies the relationship between codes, policies, and environmental review. Specific policies for each element of the environment, certain neighborhood plans, and other policies explicitly referenced may serve as the basis for exercising substantive SEPA authority.

The Overview Policy states in part: "where City regulations have been adopted to address an environmental impact, it shall be presumed that such regulations are adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation" (subject to some limitations). Under certain limitations and/or circumstances (SMC 25.05.665 D 1-7) mitigation can be considered. Thus, a more detailed discussion of some of the impacts is appropriate.

Short-term Impacts

Although no development of the site is proposed, the rezone to L1 would allow construction of up to 14 dwelling units (5 on the smaller parcel, 9 on the larger). On that basis, the following temporary or construction-related impacts are expected with future development: decreased air quality due to suspended particulates from building activities and hydrocarbon emissions from construction vehicles and equipment; increased traffic and demand for parking from construction equipment and personnel; increased noise; and consumption of renewable and nonrenewable resources. Except for noise impacts of construction of multiple townhouse units, and construction worker parking, and possibilities for tying up a very constrained circulation system, these impacts are expected to be very minor in scope and of very short duration.

Long-term Impacts

Long-term or use-related impacts are also anticipated as a result of approval of this proposal. Increasing the potential density of the site from 3 dwelling units to 14 would likely result in increased traffic in the area, increased demand for parking, increased bulk, increased light, glare and noise, decreased privacy, and increased demand for public services and utilities. All of these impacts have been addressed pursuant to rezone authority. It should be recognized that the additional authority of SEPA would be considered with future project-related permit activity associated with more than four units.

DECISION - SEPA

This decision was made after review by the responsible official on behalf of the lead agency of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the responsible department. This constitutes the Threshold Determination and form. The intent of this

declaration is to satisfy the requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21C), including the requirement to inform the public agency decisions pursuant to SEPA.

[X] Determination of Non-Significance. This proposal has been determined to not have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is not required under RCW 43.21C.030 2c.

[] Determination of Significance. This proposal has or may have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is required under RCW 43.21C.030 2c.

CONDITIONS - SEPA

None.

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS: REZONE

Upon Application for Master Use Permit:

The owner(s) and/or responsible party(s) shall:

1. Provide a concept site plan that shows:

- A. Only one vehicular access/egress curb cut
 - B. Parking designed to provide adequate buffers to protect adjacent SF-zoned properties from noise, light and glare, and odor (fumes) impacts.
 - C. Substantial (i.e. 10 foot) west side yard on the west property, to be fully landscaped (not paved in any portion), with tree canopy to cover entire strip, and to be under-planted with shade-tolerant shrubs. Groundcover to be shown, if at all, only within the east 3 feet of this landscaped strip.
2. Provide concept structure designs to ensure that there be no more adverse noise, odor, privacy, light, or shadow impacts than for construction of 3 SF homes matching the average size of existing homes in the area between North 113th and North 114th Streets, Meridian and Corliss Avenues North.
3. Provide structure elevation details showing that all street-facing facades will be compatible with the scale and character of street-facing facades of existing single family residences in the immediate vicinity.

Prior to finaling of any building permit, and for the life of the project:

3. The owner(s) and/or responsible party(s) shall maintain the development, and in particular the vehicular access, parking location and buffering, landscape buffer strip, and adverse impact mitigation features as prescribed in the Master Use Permit.

Signature: (signature of file) Date: March 20, 2003
Paul M. Janos, Land Use Planner
Department of Design, Construction and Land Use

PJ:bg

H:\DOC\2204181 2205526.doc

Matrix for Proposed Rezone: SF to L1
2130 and 2140 North 11th Street
DCLU Project Nos. 2204181 and 2205526
 20 February 2002

Criterion	Met	Not Met	N/A
23.34.011			
A	1	0	
B			
1	0	1	
2	1	0	
3			
a	0	1	
b	1	0	
c	1	0	
d	1	0	
C			
1	0	0	NA
2	0	0	N/A
D	1	0	
Totals:	6	2	

Conclusion: Subject sites clearly meet the SF criteria.

Criterion	Met	Not Met	N/A
23.24.011			
A	1	0	
B	0	1	
C			N/A

Conclusion: Subject sites may not be rezoned from SF.

Matrix for Proposed Rezone: SF to L1
2130 and 2140 North 11th Street
DCLU Project Nos. 2204181 and 2205526
 20 February 2002

Criterion	Met	Not Met	N/A
23.34.016			
A	0	1	
B			
1			
a	1	0	
b			
(1)	0	1	
(2)	0	1	
c	1	0	
2			
a	0	1	
b	0	1	
c	0	1	
d	1	0	
e	1	0	
C	0	1	
Totals:	4	7	

Conclusion: Subject sites do not well meet criteria for L1 designation.

Matrix for Proposed Rezone: SF to L1
2130 and 2140 North 11th Street
DCLU Project Nos. 2204181 and 2205526
20 February 2002

Criterion	Met	Not Met	N/A
23.34.008			
A			
1	1	0	
2	1	0	
B	0	1	
C	0	1	
D	0	1	
E	0	1	
F	0	1	
G	0	1	
H	0	1	
I			N/A
Totals:	2	7	

Conclusion: Rezone of subject sites would likely have adverse impacts.